

McClellan AFB RAB Meeting

April 24, 1996

6:30 p.m.

Vineland Elementary School

RAB members present:

Peter Berghius, Steve Brown, James Bryant, Del Callaway, Edward Freuer, Brad Gacke, Mannard Gaines, Bill Gibson, Dennis Green, Sheila Guerra, John Leuthe, Jeannie Lewis, Simeon Okoroike, Bill Shepherd, Burl Taylor, Mark Malinowski (DTSC), Joe Healy (U.S. EPA), Alex MacDonald (Regional Water Board)

RAB alternates present:

Dennis Lewis, Kirk Schmalz (McClellan AFB EMR)

RAB members not present:

Chuck Yarbrough, Dale Anderson, Susan McKee, Ben Norman, Cody Tubbs, Mario Ierardi

Others present:

Rick Blank, Law Engineering and Environmental Services

Janna Buwalda, McClellan AFB PKOP

John Carrier, Foster Wheeler Environmental

Marcy Drefs, LIAFA/IFPTE/220 McClellan

Marc Garcia, McClellan AFB EMR

LaDona Hein, Curriculum Associates Rio Linda

Ron Hergenrader, Jacobs Engineering Group

Tom Kempster, AFBCA/DM

Diane McClellan, Foster Wheeler Environmental

Col. Karen Miller, McClellan PA

Maj Robert Senchy, McClellan AFB EMRP/SGPB

Sue Sher, DTSC

Rick Solander, McClellan AFB EMR;

Jerry Vincent, McClellan AFB EMO

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Kirk Schmalz, Remedial Program Manager, of McClellan Air Force Base (AFB) Environmental Management (EM) at 6:30 p.m.

Minutes from the January 1996 RAB were approved with no corrections. Mr. Schmalz announced that Mr. Chuck Yarbrough, the RAB Community Co-chair, would not be present. Mr. Del Callaway would be acting on his behalf.

Mr. Callaway announced that:

- The ATSDR Meeting would be held on 21 May 1996 at Vineland Elementary School. The purpose of the meeting would be to discuss the final Health Assessment report.
- The Environmental Compliance Forum would be held on 8 May 1996 at the McClellan AFB Officer's Club from 6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.
- The University of California at Davis training on environmental conflict resolution would be held on 8 June 1996.

NEW BUSINESS

Cleanup and Reuse Slides

Mr. Schmalz gave a slide presentation of the McClellan AFB Cleanup and Reuse Strategy (see attached slides). He gave an overview of the forums involved in cleanup and reuse:

- BCT (BRAC Cleanup Team) - is primarily the representatives of the regulatory agencies and includes Mr. Paul Brunner, McClellan AFB BRAC Environmental Coordinator.
- RAB - Restoration Advisory Board
- BTC (Base Transition Coordinator) - Mr. Richard Benneke is the BCT for McClellan AFB and is an employee of the Department of Defense (DoD)
- LRA (Local Redevelopment Authority) - is made up of the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors and is the local agency empowered to make reuse decisions.

Mr. Schmalz described the Reuse and Cleanup Strategy as an ongoing process to incorporate privatization, reuse, and technology development (see attached slides). Privatization and reuse can take place while cleanup efforts are underway, although property cannot be transferred until a remedial action is in place at a given site. Environmental Management (EM) hopes to find a more cost effective means of cleaning up contamination at McClellan AFB by promoting and developing new technologies.

McClellan AFB expects to have all cleanup actions in place by the year 2015; after that, the focus will be on long term operation & maintenance. All investigations are expected to provide enough information to develop a Basewide Record of Decision (ROD) by the year 2003. The ROD will document how McClellan AFB will implement the cleanup.

Several environmental projects related to privatization and reuse are currently underway. The Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) is an effort to determine the current environmental condition of property. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) evaluates what environmental impacts may happen as a result of the reuse of base property. A "bottom up" review of the environmental program is underway. The review takes an objective look at where are all of the environmental programs in terms of being able to support the reuse effort. The *BRAC Cleanup Plan (BCP)*, which is similar to the *Management Action Plan*, outlines the current status and future of the program.

Mr. Schmalz reviewed the status of the environmental budget. The total cleanup budget submittal for FY97 was \$29.7 million. It is expected to be \$30.7 million in FY98. These amounts are higher than what the Air Force Base Closure Agency (AFBCA) anticipates being available.

Groundwater Cleanup Continues

Mr. Schmalz highlighted some of the actions that have taken place in the last six months toward cleanup of the groundwater (see attached). A general discussion of the presentation followed. Questions raised in that discussion are addressed under "Questions and Answers" at the end of these minutes.

Mr. Jerry Vincent, field team leader for the field project management team of the EMR, gave a slide presentation on ongoing field work for the previous six months.

For the groundwater cleanup effort, 26 groundwater monitoring wells and 7 groundwater extraction wells have recently been installed. Phase 4 of the well abandonment (closure) program has just been completed. All base wells that are planned for closure have now been closed except for BW 11 and BW 24, which have not been located.

In addition, a number of off base and residential wells have been closed. (Ms. Margaret Gidding, Public Affairs representative of EM, has the latest listing of residential wells to be closed in Phases 5 and 6.)

As part of a treatability study, a 2-PhaseTM extraction well and a dual-phase extraction well have been installed next to building 360. This treatability study will compare these two slightly different technologies to see which is more effective.

Mr. Leuthe asked into what sewer system is the water being dumped. On the west side of the base, the treated groundwater is discharged into the sanitary sewer, which goes off base. McClellan AFB has a sewer use permit and meets all standards for discharge.

Treated groundwater could be used for other purposes, such as the sprinkler system, but it is not really cost effective to tie these small systems into a larger reuse system. The groundwater extraction system on the west side will be there for a longer period of time; McClellan AFB is looking at using that water.

Soil Vapor Extraction and Investigation

Mr. Schmalz gave a presentation on the McClellan AFB Soil Vapor Extraction (SVE) systems (see attached). SVE vacuums contaminated vapor from the soil. McClellan AFB is in the process of testing treatment technologies to treat the vapor and destroy the contaminants. Currently, 8 SVE systems have been installed or are planned.

Mr. Schmalz also gave an overview of the remedial investigation phase of the program. The remedial investigation determines how much and where the contamination is. This information is used to make clean up decisions. Preliminary assessments have been completed for the entire base. Phase 1 Remedial Investigations (RI) have been completed in OU C and OU A. The RI has been completed in OU B and OU D; most of the remedial actions in place to date are in one of these two OUs. The McClellan AFB goal is to complete the remedial investigations of OU C and OU A in 1997 and the Phase 1 RI in OU E through OU H in 1998. If these investigations stay on schedule, the RI for the whole base should be complete by 1999.

Field Work

Mr. Vincent discussed some of the treatment technologies that are being tested with SVE, and other field work. In the last six months McClellan AFB has tested three slip-stream technologies. Technologies were brought in, connected to an existing soil vapor extraction system, and evaluated for use in terms of for cost effectiveness and operation. Mr. Vincent also gave an overview of other field work underway.

Underground Storage Tanks (USTs)

Mr. Vincent also explained that McClellan AFB is in the process of trying to meet its 1998 guidelines for the Underground Storage Tank (UST) program. Since many of the USTs are located on IRP sites, McClellan is in the process of cleaning those up. McClellan originally had 216 tanks, and now there are only 33 tanks. The old tanks were single walled tanks; the new tanks are double walled tanks to meet all the environmental standards. The tanks are not being placed in the ground, they are being placed above ground.

Confirmed Site 10 (CS-10)

CS-10 is the site where barrels were located that were labeled with radiation placards. Recently, several large pieces of equipment were removed from the site. Wipe samples were collected and scanned to ensure there was no surface radiological contamination at any time. The equipment was removed using a large crane. The crane was subsequently scanned to ensure that it was not contaminated.

Crusher Plant

McClellan AFB is in the process of cleaning up approximately 144,000 tons of concrete debris. It would have cost the Air Force approximately \$3.8M to take this debris to the landfill. McClellan spent \$750,000 to purchase a rock crusher that would crush and recycle the concrete and make it into reusable aggregate. The machine is also capable of removing steel rebar from the concrete for recycling. The machine costs \$200,000 to operate. The base is expected to generate additional debris when it closes due to the demolition of buildings, removal of slabs, and concrete structures. Much of the aggregate will be reused on-base; any leftover will be sold.

Industrial Wastewater Line (IWL)

The IWL consists of six miles of primary piping on the base that carries industrial wastewater to the Industrial Wastewater Treatment Plant. The line has been inspected and there is a list of what needs to be repaired. McClellan is in the process of repairing the IWL near Building 1071.

Magpie Creek Widening Project

The Magpie Creek Project is a flood control project designed to improve flood protection on base. This project was designed about four years ago and is still in the early stages. The revised project would widen and realign the creek to provide 500-year flood protection. This project is not scheduled to be built until 1998. It would start on the west side and work eastward. Mr. Mark Garcia, the McClellan Point of Contact for the project, said this project is a joint project with the City of Sacramento. The downstream portion, which is the city's project, should be done simultaneously.

When construction starts, McClellan will be sampling and looking for stained soil that might indicate contamination. McClellan has a vehicle that can treat contaminated soil in the event it is found. The plan is to treat the contaminated soil immediately, then place it back where it came from.

The water in the creek will stay as is until construction starts. During construction, the water will be channeled around the construction site. The projects will also be under the same air quality standards for any construction site, and will have to prevent the airborne spread of any contamination that might be encountered.

Mr. Steve Brown asked how long the project would take and if it would have any effect on the animal life in Magpie Creek, since it is polluted. Mr. Don Kelley, McClellan EM, answered that the widening would take approximately two years and that Magpie Creek is not polluted. It is above background levels and below action levels. Mr. Schmalz stated that an Environmental Impact Study would take place for both the off-base and on-base projects to assess any environmental impacts. If any private properties are going to be affected, owners would be contacted.

Committee Reports

Sue Sher - Community Relations

The Community Relations Committee was asked to develop an alternate pool for RAB members. The committee took a multi-faceted approach and came up with a number of ideas:

- (1) place an ad in the paper in Neighborhood Section of the Sunday Bee;
- (2) have applications distributed to the public at RAB meetings;
- (3) post a notice on the McClellan AFB World Wide Web site;
- (4) publish a notice in the July *Environmental Action Update*; and
- (5) publish a notice in the *Spacemaker*.

Ms. Jeannie Lewis has also volunteered to include a notice in her school district's newsletter. The notice may also be included in the individual schools' newspapers. Ms. Lewis also volunteered to post the notice to several news groups on the internet.

Those who are interested or know someone who may be interested is encouraged to contact Jamie Cameron-Harley for an application. The target date to have a pool of alternates is 1 September 1996.

Co-Chair and Committee Chair Announcement

Mr. Del Callaway announced the results of the recent elections of chairs for the committees. The results are as follows:

Community Relations Committee	Ms. Sue Sher
Technical Report Review Committee	Mr. John Leuthe
Relative Risk Ranking Committee	Mr. Bill Gibson
RAB Reuse	Mr. Del Callaway

Mr. Chuck Yarbrough was unanimously re-elected to serve as Community Co-Chair.

Mr. Callaway made a correction to the announcement of the Environmental Compliance Forum's Agenda. The Magpie Creek issue would be part of the agenda at the meeting on 8 May 1996, and the public is welcome.

Community Bulletin Board

Ms. Margaret Gidding announced the public comment period for the Environmental Baseline Survey. A copy of the public notice that ran in the base paper was available for review. Members of the Community Relations committee were reminded to submit their comments on the Community Relations Update as soon as possible.

Development of Next RAB Meeting Agenda - July 24, 1996

The following items were suggested for the future RAB meeting agendas.

EBS/EIS Update

Groundwater Update (Technical Review Committee)

SVE/GW - Trend analysis

Technology -Cost/Benefit analysis

Subcommittee reports

LRA Update from Burl Taylor

ATSDR- Some aspect of status (Risk Committee)

Cleanup cost comparison with other bases (Technical Review Committee)

RAB Worksheet update

Review community relations budget (Community Relations Committee)

Questions and Answers

The following questions were raised during the RAB meeting. Answers are provided below:

- Mr. Steve Brown, RAB member, asked whether the replacement of the carbon at Base Well 18 had been completed.

The answer was yes, the carbon has been replaced.

- Mr. Frank Miller, community member, asked if there had been a misuse of DERA funds to pay for the Environmental Management office move from building 250 to 269.

Defense Environmental Restoration Account (DERA) funds were not used to move EMR personnel in 1992. The move that took place in 1992 was to move EMR personnel from building 250HH to building 250N and 250M. Because this was such a short distance, the physical move was accomplished by EMR personnel moving themselves. The preparation of the offices was accomplished through our own resources as a self help project. Some funding was utilized to buy the supplies (i.e., carpet tiles, paint, ceiling tiles, etc.) that were used by EM personnel who prepared those offices. Some funds were also utilized to connect modular furniture together. The modular furniture was provided to EM at no cost by another organization on base that no longer needed it. The funding used for the supplies and connecting of the modular furniture was operation and maintenance funds as well as Environmental Compliance funds. These expenditures are eligible for this type of funding.

- Mr. Miller asked why a \$100,000 contract was awarded to pay for services of a ride share coordinator.

Sacramento is a severe non-attainment area, which means our air violates both federal and state standards for acceptable air quality. As a very large employer, the base promotes ride sharing. What McClellan had formerly was a secretary who would issue carpool decals. She did this in addition to her regular duties. What McClellan has now is a contract that supports the rideshare coordinator and a full program marketing ride sharing and other alternative commuter opportunities to reduce vehicle usage.

The contract total of \$86,400 pays for several marketing items, as well as the salary of the coordinator, Rebecca Garrison. It pays for office equipment and supplies; graphic art fees; and printing of different types of materials, poster, flyers, applications. The coordinator supports and works closely with public agencies to include the American Lung Associations, Caltrans, the City of Sacramento, and private industries to obtain the Sacramento clean air goals.

- Mr. Ted Freuer, RAB member, asked how much exchange of information is there between bases in addressing similar contamination problems.

Mr. Schmalz answered that the regulatory agencies provide information to all the bases, particularly of what facilities in California are doing. Mr. Mark Malinowski, DTSC, stated that he communicates weekly with project managers of various military facilities and ideas are shared. Technical details require site specific information. If there is new treatment technology, the regulatory agencies attempt to make sure that everyone has that information.

Mr. Bill Gibson, RAB member, stated that Mr. Yarbrough has endeavored to keep the RAB committee chairs of the Sacramento Army Depot and Mather RAB aware of McClellan's RAB meeting. ~~Mr. Yarbrough also attends the California Caucus of RABs, which meets in San Francisco.~~ Efforts are made to stay in contact with other RABs in order not to "re-invent the wheel."

- Ms. Jeannie Lewis, RAB member, asked what direction the gray water line goes.

The gray water generally runs north to south, and from the west side of the base all the way to the east side of the base. The water is used for watering the lawns and area where McClellan AFB has a running track, baseball diamond, and a park area.

- Mr. Miller inquired about the switching of the contractors to operate the Groundwater Treatment Plant from Metcalf & Eddy to CH2M Hill and the ongoing investigation into that matter.

Mr. Kirk Schmalz stated that he could not comment on that question due to the ongoing investigation.

- Mr. Miller expresses his opinion that a "thug-like" mentality was permeating through the department and that he was concerned with the potential escalation to violence.

Ms. Margaret Gidding, Environmental Community Affairs noted that the article in the Sacramento News and Review states the McClellan AFB cannot comment on this because of the privacy act issues involved with this. The person in question has not waived those; therefore, McClellan AFB can not address it. These are allegations and they are being addressed. There will be answers forthcoming.

- Mr. Dennis Green, RAB member, asked what the three chemicals of most concern in the groundwater are, and what the target cleanup level of each is.

Mr. Schmalz stated that the most prevalent chemicals were TCE, PCE, and 1,1-DCE. The MCL for TCE and PCE is 5 parts per million each; the MCL for 1,1-DCE is 6 ppm. The remedial actions taken as part of the Groundwater OU IROD is to contain the contamination on base.

- Mr. Miller asked about a U-shaped moat that was formerly a part of the Magpie Creek project, which had been dropped from the latest project plans. He wanted to know why that portion of the project was dropped. He also raised concern that \$9 million for the project was too much, especially since there was no record of the base ever flooding.

As mentioned, in 1994 there were five phases to the Magpie Creek Project. The U-shaped moat programmed at the south end of the runway was to serve as a holding pond to control the volume coming from the east side of the base. In June 1995, this portion of the Magpie Creek project was withdrawn because of the proposed widening of the creek from the west end of the base by the County project. The holding pond was no longer needed by that time. The consolidation of all Magpie Creek-related projects (5 projects) was to ensure that the entire length of the creek has designed and constructed properly to achieve the main goal to prevent flooding on base proper and also not create flooding off base.

The \$9 million programmed for the Magpie Creek Project was the projected cost estimate from the design and construction engineers. This was to accommodate a 100-year flood. Although the base has not experienced severe flooding to date, the proposed project was to prevent flooding if and when a 100-year flood occurs. There have been many improvements (development) at the east side of the base and storm water flow has increased. This project was to maintain these flow rates and to prevent flooding. In regards to the project cost, we'll be glad to coordinate a visit for you with the Civil Engineers.

Since the RAB meeting took place, the House of Representatives eliminated the money for the project from the federal budget for the fiscal year that begins October 1.

- Mr. Miller asked EMR personnel to evaluate the cost of the public relations efforts, community relations, and the production of the EPIC Greensheets.

Ms. Gidding stated that EPIC Greensheets are prepared with a partnership. EM has a community relations budget for restoration, which is discussed in the RAB Community Relations Committee. The Community Relations Committee discusses what was spent, what we do, and what the requirements are there for community relations. She added that the budget has been decreasing.

Ms. Sue Sher offered to provide a status report in that forum and to present it to the RAB.

- Mr. Frank Miller inquired about the electric vehicles and whether McClellan AFB is really developing and building the vehicles or just leasing them.

The Alternative Fuel Vehicle Program manages the assignment, maintenance, and repair of over 60 electric vehicles (EVs). McClellan AFB uses the EVs in the performance of official transportation missions. The Air Force owns all of these EVs. Last year these vehicles logged over 70,000 miles of "zero emission" service.

About 2 years ago, US Electricar announced its intentions to pursue the manufacture and/or assembly of vehicles at McClellan AFB. Poor economic times for US Electricar have caused them to drop this proposal. McClellan AFB (Environmental Management and Technology and Industrial Support Directorates) is working with the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) on a Cooperative Research and Development Agreement (CRDA) to produce three to five lightweight, ultra-efficient composite vehicles for test and evaluation. One goal of the CRDA is to develop a vehicle design that is safe, manufacturable, and can be affordably produced. The manufacturing and/or assembly of the production vehicle may well be a reuse opportunity for McClellan AFB. We invite people to contact Mr. Phil Mook, Alternative Fuel Vehicle Manager, at (916) 643-5443 for additional information.

- Mr. Miller inquired about a 16 March *Sacramento Bee* article about a new medical procedure that would use McClellan AFB's nuclear reactor. He was concerned that the FDA should approve any new procedure.

The type of brain tumor treated by this process is inoperable and fatal. FDA approval is required before any treatment of this type can be done; approval has been granted to both Brookhaven National Laboratory and MIT. Both of these institutions are actively using this therapy. The initial results are very encouraging. The McClellan Nuclear Radiation Center/UC Davis Dept of Neurology have been working together for the last three years to develop the same capability on the west coast.

- Mr. Dennis Green asked if Environmental Management could prepare a one page summary that compares the concentrations of the most prevalent compounds last year to those collected this year, to see how much progress is being made towards those cleanup levels.

A simple comparison of concentration levels from 1995 to 1996 does not show much change, due to frequency of well sampling under the GSAP (at most, quarterly) and small fluctuations (+ and -) in contamination levels in sampled wells. The information below covers several years (1991 - present) with respect to TCE. The information below was taken from *Trend Analysis Technical Memorandum* (Radian, Feb. 1996). The trend analysis is technical in nature and what follows below is a simplification of the current contamination levels.

Three plumes are easily identified on McClellan AFB. These have been designated as OU A, OU B/C, and OU D plumes (CH2M Hill, 1995a). Areas and volumes are calculated with respect to specific monitoring zones (A, B, C, and D from shallowest to deepest), and specific concentration levels (i.e. 100 parts per billion [ppb], 10 ppb, and 1 ppb). Overall, plume sizes and volumes have remained relatively constant with the installation of extraction systems. Apparent increases in plume size and volume for the most part can be attributed to the installation and sampling of new monitoring wells (in maps from the various years). That is, this apparent increase is not due to spreading contamination. The most dramatic change in plume size has been in the OU D plume in the northwestern part

of the base. This plume has shown a decrease in area, size, and volume since 1990 as a result of the extraction system operation. A more detailed technical analysis follows:

OU A Plume (southeastern part of the base)

Changes in the 1 ppb A-Zone areas are caused by sample concentrations from two off-site wells (MW-1058 and MW-1067) fluctuating between less than 1 ppb and greater than 1 ppb in alternate quarters. A decrease in the C-Zone 1 ppb area volume was noted from fourth quarter 1993 through 1994. The area and volume of the 10 ppb and greater plume has been relatively constant since 1991. Apparent increases in area and volume are related to the installation and sampling of additional wells in the OU A, plume rather than actual increases in the extent of contamination. Short-term increases above 10 ppb have been noted in individual A- and B-Zone wells; concentrations then dropped below 10 ppb when the wells were sampled next. Increasing TCE concentrations have been detected in a small area of the OU A plume. Sample concentrations greater than 100 ppb were first detected in the B-Zone aquifer during 1991. Concentrations greater than 100 ppb were first detected in the A-Zone in 1995.

O U B/C Plume (west side of base)

Sample results from wells installed to the southeast of the main plume and sampled in 1993 and 1994 caused the A-Zone 1 ppb contour to be extended to the southwestern base boundary. A smaller area of the A-Zone contamination shows increasing area/volume beginning in 1995, and is probably related to the addition of new wells within the plume rather than spreading of pre-existing contamination. Areas and volumes of the plume in the B zone with concentrations of 1, 10, and 100 ppb have increased slightly since 1990. These increases appear to represent downward migration of contamination.

OU D Plume

The A-Zone plume area and volume has decreased gradually since 1990 as a result of the extraction system operating in OU D. 1994, the area and volume of contamination within all isoconcentration contours decreased more rapidly than in prior years.

Maximum concentrations dropped below 1,000 ppb during the fourth quarter 1994, and only a single groundwater sample concentration greater than 1,000 ppb was detected in 1995.